

E433

.H182



0 011 897 813 4

HOLLINGER
pH 8.5
MILL RUN F3-1543

S P E E C H

OF

HON. B. F. HALLETT, OF MASS.,

AT

THE DEMOCRATIC RATIFICATION MEETING IN WALTHAM, MASS., FRIDAY
EVENING, NOVEMBER 2, 1855.

Mr. HALLETT was loudly applauded as he came upon the platform, and spoke as follows:

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: When we are called upon to exercise that great prerogative that belongs only to American citizens, the right of free suffrage, we should well consider what are the questions that call for our deliberate action. That power which every man holds in this great country—the power by his own will of declaring, as one of the majority who exercises the like power, who shall be his rulers, who shall make the laws by which he is to abide; that great power, when you come to exercise it, is one with which no man should proceed to the ballot-box without careful deliberation. Now, gentlemen, we are upon the eve of a State election, merely; and, as you know, it is the custom of political orators to say—"This coming election is the most important one ever had in the history of the world!" This, though not generally applicable to a State election, is essentially true, in one particular, of the election in Massachusetts; because, although you are to choose only your State officers, you are taking the preliminary steps to that great division of the people of this country, which is to be made, North and South, throughout this Union next year, in the presidential election. In that election, whatever may be the local names of factions, there will be but two parties; one, a party for the Constitution, the other, a party against the Constitution; one, a party for the Union, the other, a party for disunion; one, a sectional party composed of a sectional portion of the North, the other, a party of the whole country. Now, on which side are you going to stand? That is the issue.

And why does this great national issue arise now? Ordinarily we go into an election—as we have for the last twenty-five years—with the Democratic party and the Whig party as the main armies on both sides contending under their well-known flags; and then we knew where we were and what the results were likely to be. But in the next presidential election we are to have a new organization, or rather disorganization, of parties. Some people, very wise in their own conceit, pretend to have found out that the old parties were corrupt, and must be broken up, and that a new party must be formed, an *incorruptible* party of which they were to be the *incorruptible* leaders, and which was to be made up of all anti-slavery men and Native Americans taken from the old parties. How they accomplished this, we saw last winter in the State house! But bad as the new parties both have been in prac-

ticie and legislation, one good result certainly has flowed from their winnowing out old parties. It has very much tended to purify the Democratic party, and has relieved it from a great many men who were impatient, selfish, dissatisfied while in our ranks, and were always wanting to be something other than *Democrats*. If there are any men of that description within your acquaintance, who have always been a disturbing element in the party, all I can say is, if they have gone over to the Free-Soil party, or the Fusion party, or the Know Nothing party, just "*let them slide!*" [Applause.] And, moreover, if you know any man that you have fostered and warmed into political life on your hearths—one you had taken from his unfriended boyhood, and brought up by your hands, carried in your arms, cherished in your bosoms, and trained up to manhood—and then, by your suffrages, placed him in offices of honor, profit, and trust, and just when you supposed you had imbued him with Democratic principles, and made him true to his party and true to his country—you find that man, after all your training, all your kindness, all your confidence, and after all the honors you had heaped upon him, deserting first to the "*secret order*" of midnight cabals, and then betraying them and enlisting under the black flag of disunion, and there denouncing the Democratic Administration, sneering at the Constitution, and proclaiming that he is ready to "*LET THE UNION SLIDE!*"—I say to you, see to it that you "*slide*" that man clean off from all connection with the Democratic party, now and forever!* [Loud applause.]

And I pray you, brother Democrats, now, when we are once more getting to be a peaceable family, when we can get together and talk of the Constitution and the Union; when we can talk of the fraternity of the northern Democracy and the southern Democracy—one great brotherhood bound together for the good of the whole country in one bond of common union;—now that we can do that without the hypocrisy, the insinuations, the backbiting, the pitiful side issues of men coming in with their narrow prejudices, and sectarianism, and sectionalism; now, that we can do that, I say, let us shut the door and keep those men out!—never let them back into your confidence, to disturb our peace and betray our party! [Cheers.]

Now, then, what are these issues that are

* Hon. N. P. BANKS, of Waltham, formerly a Democrat, in his speech in the Republican convention in Maine, speaking of the preservation of the Union, said: "*I am willing, in a certain state of circumstances, to let it slide!*"

brought before the people? It is said, suddenly, that there are two awful terrors that are about to destroy the institutions of our country. One of these great terrors is, *slavery*; the other arises from the *foreign-born citizens* that are among us. These two things, one would suppose, from the excitement that has taken place recently about them, were *new things* just discovered. You would suppose, from the arguments of these people, that they have made a grand discovery. They tell you that you are to restrict yourselves to the narrow limits of two ideas, one of anti-slavery, another of hatred to foreign born, and that there you are to stop, and have nothing to do for your country beyond them. And, from the way in which these two propositions are put forward as the "paramount issues," it would appear that these things—slavery and foreigners—had never before existed in this country.

Who that listens to these declaimers would suppose that this country, when it went into the battles of the Revolution, was made up of foreign born and native born, and no man either knew or inquired whence another came? Who would suppose that when the Union was formed most of the original States had the institution of domestic slavery, and said not a word about it, except to agree to respect each other's rights, and send back fugitives from service? Who would suppose that this institution of slavery, existing as a fixed domestic institution in one half the States of the Confederacy, from that day to this, a period of seventy years, with the number of adopted citizens increasing from that day to this, and with such an accession of territory, such a vast expansion of our country, that you can dip one hand in the Atlantic on the one side, and the other in the Pacific on the other side, and say, this great country is ours!—who would suppose, I say, from the clamor of these new parties, that we had gone on in this way, and become what we are, and yet had foreign born and slavery all the while existing among us? Yet such is the fact, and where has been the destruction, the ruin of our country, from either of these sources? Is not that one fact enough to teach us that all this clamor about these two sources of danger, against which we are told the whole North must fuse and combine, is utterly unfounded—got up, devised, and fabricated with some other end in view than the good of the country?

THE KNOW NOTHING ISSUE.

I am not going to speak at length this evening upon the question of foreign born, but merely allude to it. A great many men say that we must make up a party exclusively against the influence of foreign-born citizens among us, and especially that we must "*down with the Pope*," who lives a great way off—we do not exactly know where, for he has scarcely a foothold upon which to stand from day to day; and instead of exhorting us, as our good old fathers did, against "the devil and his works," they tell us that there is nothing now to be feared but "the Pope and his works." [Laughter and cheers.] I suppose there are some very honest and sincere men and women who are terribly afraid of the Pope, and I pity them very much. I cannot but commiserate those citizens who are so wofully frightened at this "raw-head and Bloody-bones." [Laughter.] I am very sorry for them, and I want them to pluck up courage and get cured.

If they are terrified at the foreign population among us, and really fear that the Pope and the Irishmen will murder or drive all the native Americans out of the country, I really pity them again, that they are so much influenced by such weak fears. I want to stand by them; and I can assure them that the Democratic party, whether successful or not in this State, will certainly be successful in the United States, and they will protect them. [Applause and hisses.] I tell you, my friends of the secret order, you may need that protection by-and-by, because under that you derive the only power that enables you to hold your secret midnight lodges, and to stand here and hiss to-night. [Loud cheers.] If it was not for that Democratic power which gives freedom to every man, instead of standing here to-night under the shield of that Constitution you are trying to destroy, of that Union you are trying to disperse, you would have despotism over you; and should you dare to hold a secret or public meeting, and speak upon any subject, the first word or the first *hiss* that came from your heads would be followed by a file of soldiers carrying you off to some Bastile. [Loud applause, mingled with faint hisses.] That is what you owe to American institutions, which you are trying to break down, by these futile attempts to incite hatred of races, and bring up sectional issues, and form geographical parties.

Upon that point, fellow-citizens, the foreign born, there is no danger. We have got only about two millions of foreign born among us. I wish they were doubled in our broad prairies! I care not how many come here if they will come and settle our lands, and bring with them the capital letter than the paper stocks your banks and corporations dead in, the capital of bones, and muscles, and brains, and sound industry. [Applause, and a few hisses.] That is the capital which has built up the United States of America, which has made "the wilderness to blossom as the rose." Here are two millions of foreign born, I say, and we have twenty-four or five millions of native born against these two millions, and I reckon we can take care of them! [Laughter.] There is no foundation for any alarm on that point. I am not willing to give in my adhesion to the Know Nothing doctrine that holds up the idea that *twelve Americans cannot flog one Irishman!* [Loud laughter and applause.] Moreover, I believe that whenever it is necessary to flog anybody, to defend and protect this country, and especially if we should ever have occasion to flog England, which I trust we shd not, there are no men who would go into it with such a hearty shillalah relish as the Irishmen. [Applause.] They would stand by you to-day as they did at Bunker Hill, and at Yorktown, at New Orleans, at Monterey and Buena Vista; as they did in every battle that has immortalized the fields that Americans have won. Let that pass.

THE "ISMS" OF MASSACHUSETTS.

It is a little deplorable that, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the most densely populated State, for its territory, of any in the Union; the State that has the most schools, the greatest number of churches, the highest degree of education,—it is amazing, *amazing*, that here, in this Commonwealth, in such absurdities as Know Nothingism and Abolitionism should take deeper root than in any other part of this country!

Why is it? Are religion and education adverse to good government? Does religion and education tend to make men fanatics instead of peaceful, moral citizens, nullificationists instead of unionists? I will not believe it. It is a perversion. Above all it is a perversion of the pulpit, in the first instance, to political purposes, and out of that has grown up this great, wide-spread evil. It has been fostered by the practice of sending missionaries in the guise of ministers, and anti-slavery lecturers all over the Commonwealth, who, instead of preaching the Bible, preach politics; instead of preaching the Constitution, preach disunion, instead of preaching brotherly love, preach hatred of sections and races, hatred of foreign born, hatred between the North and the South, and stir up intolerance and all manner of uncharitableness among us. Let us banish these ideas and teachings, and come back to the doctrines of the fathers, to the Bible and the Constitution.

Now, as regards this issue of hatred to foreign-born citizens, I pass it over with this single remark, that I can never cease to bear in mind this fact: When a man boasts that he is a native-born American citizen, and derides another man who is not native born, but who has the same rights of citizenship as he has, it seems to me that the adopted citizen may well say to the native born, "Why, sir, you are an American citizen by accident; you were born here and could not help it. I, sir, am an American citizen by choice; I came here when my will and my mind brought me here." And, as has been well said in other respects, the only difference between a full-grown American citizen born here, and the other citizen who has come here and been made a citizen, is, that, so far as concerns this new world, one of them came into the world without any clothes on, and the other with his clothes on. [Laughter and loud applause.] Let us thank God that there is room enough here for both to work in and continue to clothe themselves, and to be happy and prosperous.

THE FUSION ISSUE—"THE AGGRESSIONS OF THE SLAVE POWER."

But I want to touch more directly upon this question of anti-slavery—this fusion doctrine—which is now in the field as the very newest of the "new parties." Passing over this question of the terrible aggressions of the Catholics, which some very timid people are so frightened about, let us look at this other issue—"this great and paramount issue," as Mr. Julius Rockwell calls it: "*The aggression of the slave power.*" Can anybody tell me what that means? Why, when Mr. Senator Sumner gets up to address an audience, he asks, "Are you in favor of freedom or are you in favor of slavery?" Suppose you answer "yes," or "no," what does that amount to? Suppose you answer we are all in favor of freedom; what then, Mr. Sumner? "Why—why—I don't exactly know," says Mr. Sumner, only he reads an advertisement for a runaway negro down South, and then goes off into some fine flourish of rhetoric and plenty of quotations from the classical dictionary.

But let us follow him up with the practical question, "What are you going to do? Suppose you could combine all the North against the South, are you going to dissolve the Union?" "Oh, no," says Mr. Sumner; "we are for the Union, provided we can drive slavery out of it."

"But suppose you cannot drive it out of the States or out of the Territories, and keep the South in the Union, what then? Will you force the South to stay in the Union and be ruled by negroes? Will you *fight* the South?" "Yes," says Senator Wade, of Ohio, "that is just what we mean to do—*set the dogs on them.*" That is his fusion remedy. The Black Republicans are to get an Abolition President and an Abolition Congress if they can, and vote the South down; and then, if the southern members retire from Congress, and refuse to be bound by it, the Abolition leaders are to "set the dogs on them!" Who are to be "the dogs?" Why, the farmers, the mechanics, the workingmen, the "Know Nothings" of Massachusetts and other Abolition States,—they are to be "the dogs," to carry on a civil war with the South for the benefit of Messrs. Seward, Wade, Sumner, Wilson, and company, to make them the great men of the North. [Cries of "No! no!"] No, you will not do it; I know you will not do it; the North will never do it.

I tell you, then, that this plausible question, "Are you for freedom or are you for slavery?" is not the real issue. The real question is, "Are you for the Constitution or against it? Are you for upholding the Government of the United States or for anarchy, revolution, and disunion?" That is the question. If you are for the Constitution, then you are for the existence of the Union under that Constitution just as it stands, with slavery existing, just as our fathers found it. Not as a national but as a State right institution, with the principle inseparable from the right of self-government that grows out of it, viz: the right of every political community to regulate that matter for themselves under the Constitution. That is the Democratic doctrine to settle all these sectional and geographical differences, which by agitation are made so often to threaten the Union.

There must be some point of sound conservatism touching the slavery question, upon which Union men North and South must agree to repose, or the two sections will finally irritate each other into disunion. Where shall we find it?

This new fusion or Republican party, as they miscall themselves, offer no remedies for the evils they complain of, except their insane idea of getting possession of the Government and conquering the South!

The Democratic party propose a clear and distinct settlement of all these sectional quarrels. It is "*the principle of non-intersection by Congress with slavery in the States and in the Territories.*"

That is simply the fundamental doctrine of Democratic institutions, *the right of self-government*,—a wonderful pacifier, if we will only apply it to the Union, the State, the Territory, the town, the parish, the family, each in its proper sphere, each under its own proper constitution.

The zealots, and fanatics, and reformers who, for twenty-five years, have been casting about for a place to rest their lever on to move the world, have settled down upon *rum* and *negroes*. The whole statesmanship of the country, they tell us, must now be fused and absorbed in that. If there were no alcohol, there would be no vice; if there were no social distinction between negroes and white men, there would be no slavery. Hence all this false legislation about temperance, and all this sectional clamor at the North about slavery at the South. Are they not both wrong? There

can be no moral reform effected by mere legislation, unless the legislation is just, and based on sound constitutional principles.

THE MAINE LAW ISSUE.

Let us test the modern legislation on *alcohol*. Instead of following the sound principle of our fathers, which was to regulate the evils that God Almighty had permitted to exist among them; instead of recognizing in civil government the principle God has established in divine government that man is a free agent, and appealing to his reason, these modern law-givers contend that the only way to make men virtuous is to destroy all temptations to vice—to prohibit and remove from use every good thing that can be abused to a bad use.

Hence, instead of regulating the use of intoxicating drinks, as our fathers did for two hundred years, they undertake to make all use of it for drink, a *crime*. But the killing inconsistency is that when they undertook to make it a *crime*, they made *only one half of it a crime*, punishable with the house of correction, and left the *other half* as free from crime as drinking water. They make it a *crime* for one man to stand behind a counter and take sixpence for a glass of alcohol, and they leave it as free as the most virtuous act for the other man to buy, and drink, and pay for it! [Applause.]

Now, that is making one half of an act a *crime*, and the other half not a *crime*. Do you not see that that is a false principle? that you cannot declare that a *crime* which is committed by two parties, and cannot be committed by one, and make it a *crime* in one and declare it no *crime* in the other? Therefore you see why the foundation principle of this whole legislation fails; for they do not dare to come forward and say, "Punish the man who *buys* as well as the man who *sells*."

But why not, if selling is a *crime*? Why, what would these law-temperance folks say if you should propose to make it a *crime* to sell a negro into slavery, and no *crime* to buy him? If you should declare that the man who sells him should be punished, but the man who buys him left unmolested to do with him as he pleased? Would they not scout the idea? But do they not act upon this principle in regard to the liquor traffic? The man who sells and never drinks, says this Maine law, shall be sent to the house of correction, though he never would sell unless tempted to do so by a buyer. But the man who buys and drinks and commits the *other half* of the *crime*, he is only to be pitied and not to be punished at all?

That is false legislation, wrong in morals, wrong in government, and therefore it has failed. For twenty years the law-temperance men have been at work drawing the strings tighter and tighter, until they had got the bow strung up tight enough to strangle every dealer they could catch with a decanter on his shelf; and what has been the result? Why the tension has been so high, that the string has suddenly snapped, and away has gone the Maine law. From Maine on the Atlantic side to California on the Pacific side the people are determined to sweep this false legislation into the sea, and now there is a reaction dangerous to the cause of temperance, even in its beautiful and healthful moral aspect. Such is the end of false and bad legislation inflicted on a people who choose their own law-makers.

ANTI-SLAVERY HAS INJURED THE ANTI-SLAVERY CAUSE.

Next let us examine the other evil which the Fusion Reformers are proclaiming "paramount"—the slavery question. That, too, is in pretty much the same hands, and runs on the same wrong track with the other "isms" of Law-Temperance and Know Nothingism.

The Abolitionists, Free-Soilers, and Anti-Slavery men, of all shades, have been at work upon that matter for fifty years. The North began its aggressions upon the South from the day that Thomas Jefferson was elected President over John Adams; not for love of the slave, but because Jefferson was in a slave State, and the Federal opponents of Democracy of that day played upon the philanthropy of the North to get up a "fusion" to put down the Democracy of the South.

The State of Massachusetts was the most intensely Federal State in the Union, and thus inheriting the old Federal hate to Jefferson, Louisiana, and the extension of territory, she is naturally now the most intensely abolition and southern hating State in the Union. And what has been the result of her operations against the Union based on this anti-slavery element? Her Legislature has always been mainly subservient to the dictation of a minority of political Abolitionists. Whether in the hands of Whigs, Democrats, Coalitionists, or Know Nothings, any resolutions against slavery which a single Abolition demagogue called for, were passed as a matter of course. It was thought safer to let the few demagogues have their way than to offend what the demagogues and pulpit politicians called "the sentiment of Massachusetts on slavery." Hence the demagogues and the canting pulpit politicians have had it all their own way, and reason has not dared to stand up and combat error. Massachusetts has disgraced herself by sending volumes of anti-slavery resolutions to other States to insult them. We have had abolition preaching and anti-slavery lectures upon the "cause of freedom" as they call it, meaning *nigro freedom*, until now they tell us they have found the philosopher's stone to dissolve slavery and the Union together, and they are going to do it by "fusion." And here they are, after fifty years of a sectional quarrel, kept up by a noisy, hollow-hearted faction in New England, not so far advanced in negro freedom as we should have been if we had just let the South alone upon slavery, and left each State free to carry out its own plans of melioration and gradual emancipation.

RED JACKET'S PLAN OF FUSION.

Why, all these anti-slavery people who talk about "fusion" to get rid of slavery, have not half the wisdom or shrewdness of the old Indian chief, Red Jacket, whose fusion plan was just about as practical, but more rational, and not so likely to dissolve the Union if carried into operation. When Andrew Jackson was President of the United States, and the Legislatures of Virginia and Kentucky were freely discussing, like calm statesmen, the means of gradual emancipation, before the political Abolitionists threw in their fire-brands, it happened on one occasion, when Red Jacket called upon the President, that this subject of slavery was introduced, and the President asked Red Jacket what he thought could be done to get rid of slaves in this country? "Why," said Red Jacket, "you must send all the colored

women of the North South, and all the colored men of the South North, and in two or three generations you will get rid of it." [Laughter.] That was a much wiser proposition, and more statesmanlike, than anything the Abolitionists bring up. How do they propose to get rid of it? Why, they say, go on and irritate the South until you drive them out of the Union. Well, suppose you could do it—suppose you drive them out of the Union—are there any less slaves in the country? Not one. Then you could not abolish slavery in the South, for it would be utterly beyond your reach. But they say, nevertheless, let us keep up at the North an incessant noise and agitation about slavery. What good will that do? It only exasperates the South, and does not help the slaves. Then steal the negroes, and send them off on the underground railroad. How soon will you get three millions of slaves off in that way? That will not do.

Well, they say, if a fugitive slave comes here to Massachusetts, and they attempt to send him back under the laws and Constitution, get all the anti-slavery people together, kill the marshal, kill everybody, and then have shootings and hangings, mobs and riots, and a real Jacobin French reign of terror, and all that about one negro! How much has that done to abolish slavery, or to make Kansas a free State?

WHITE SLAVERY ATTEMPTED IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Why, look at the *wisdom* and consistency of these "friends of freedom," as they call themselves, above all others. They went into the Legislature of Massachusetts, without even a minority to oppose them, and passed a law declaring, that if the marshal of the United States should undertake to return a fugitive slave, under a law of the Constitution which is just as constitutional as the Constitution itself, the whole military power of Massachusetts must be called out to shoot down the officers of the Government while in the discharge of their duty.

A VOICE "Good."

Mr. HALLETT—Yes, good to show your feels. [Applause.] I will tell you what you will have to meet that you call "good," on the side of *law*; the soldiers of the United States, the armed citizens who mean to stand by the Union against abolition mobs, the whole military power of the United States called out by the President, if need be, to maintain the laws; ay, and the *volunteer militia of Massachusetts*, who, if called upon by an abolition Governor under that treasonable act, will join the side of the Union, and help put down all traitors, rebels, and rioters! [Loud applause, and faint hissing.] These are the men who talk about resisting the laws of the Union, and when it comes to the point are the most arrant cowards in the world. They do not dare to look a brave man in the eye. I have seen them, and tested them, and know all about them.

Now, I say, they made that treasonable nullification law last winter, with reference to one single black man; by which act they indicated their willingness to involve this Commonwealth in a war with the United States, to put her out of the Union, to trample upon the compacts of the Constitution, upon everything sacred and holy, and violate the oaths they had solemnly taken,—and all that for *one* black man. And then, on the very next page of the statute-book, they put another act declaring that any white

man who had come into this State should not be allowed the rights of citizenship unless he had been born in this country. And by that act they meant, if in their power, to take away all political rights from at least forty thousand white men in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, while, at the same time, they were ready to go to war with the United States to save, unlawfully, the supposed rights of one negro. And forever hereafter, if this *ultra-American* party rules, runaway negroes are to be received with open arms, and every hunted patriot, fleeing from the tyranny of the Old World, to be denied an asylum, and sent back as a pauper!

And is that thing to be our Massachusetts? Are such the men she is to select to guide the helm of State and take care of the prosperity and the honor of the old Commonwealth?

What but discord, discredit, disgrace, if not disunion, can come to Massachusetts or the North by this unavailing and incessantly irritating aggression of the abolition section of the North upon the South? Has all the agitation in Congress by a minority ever gained anything? Could you *fuse* every voter of the North into an Abolitionist, and get a majority Abolition Congress and President, would you gain anything then but disunion? And if you should finally bring about what these Know Nothing fusion leaders in the North are using the voters of the North for, a disruption of the Union, what then have you gained but two Republics, one with slavery and one without? And I tell you that when two such Republics are formed, (if ever God leaves us to such judicial blindness,) and the runaway negroes from the South overspread your territory, then even if the South abandon them, and there is no civil war, you will have to build forty almshouses for their reception, and support them as paupers, or else send them out of the Commonwealth as a burden too grievous to be borne. And these very men, now the most clamorous for negro freedom, will be the most earnest to have them sent back! Let us see, gentleman liberators, what your philanthropy amounts to. Here are a little rising of three millions of slaves in this country and twenty five millions of white people. The proportion of these negroes, if freed, for Massachusetts, is about one hundred and twenty thousand. Is she ready to open her arms and take this *uniformed mass* to her bosom, and sit down with them in social and political fraternity? Of course they are not to keep them at the South. They would be worthless and unavailing there just as in Jamaica. If the South frees them out of compliment to the North, the North must take care of them. The South would not keep them, because then the South and West would be filled up by northern and foreign laborers, who would flee from contact with the degraded free slave labor of the North, and go South, and thus the North would have negro labor, and the South the benefit and strength of free white labor, and instead of being our market, she would be our competitor, and the North would run down with the worst and most degrading "fusion" of pauper labor. So that if this fusion, anti-slavery scheme could possibly succeed either by civil war or consent of the South, it would just change the North into a worse condition as to labor than the South by giving us all the negro labor—the worst kind of labor, free slave labor—and all its consequent pauperism.

Now the common sense of the North, the self-respect of her working men, will never follow any leaders, or "fuse" into any formidable party for such purposes or such results as these.

Fusion is useless, therefore, except to produce only worse confusion on the slavery question.

NON-INTERVENTION THE ONLY CONSERVATIVE DOCTRINE.

What are we going to do about it then? Let these agitators follow the advice of Jefferson, whom they affect to quote. We of the South said Mr. Jefferson in substance, have got the wolf by the ears, and if we let him go, he will tear us in pieces. All we can do is to hold on. So if you ask us what the States who have got no slaves shall do about slavery, the answer of the Democratic party is, *let it alone!* Let those who have got the wolf hold on, or tame and loose him as they choose, and don't let us be tickling his tail to stimulate his rage, and compel his master to hold him tighter. [Cheers.]

How easy it is to let it alone, and instead of the sectional embroilment take care of the great interests of the State and country. What is it to Senator Seward, or any other northern man, if South Carolina, as he pretends, has her

faavored class of slaveholders, any more than it is to South Carolina, that New York and Massachusetts have their favored classes of bankers, manufacturers, and merchant princes? The Constitution of the United States has no concern with it, because all these classes or privileges are created by state legislation, and the General Government makes no war on either. Just so if the people of a new Territory or a new State adapted to slave labor, insist upon having it, where do we of the North get the right to legislate it out of a Territory, any more than they of the South have to legislate it in?

Your sentiments and mine are opposed to slavery, but is that any reason why we should go on a crusade against the South to liberate the slaves, or make a battle-ground of a southern territory to keep it out? No more than it is that we should go on a crusade into Russia to free the serfs in that country; and I confess I am rather more opposed to white slavery than to black slavery, though some people seem to think there is no sympathy to be felt for a man unless he be black. Even the Fusionists do not pretend to a right to interfere with Russia in her system of domestic white servitude, and yet we have less right to interfere with South Carolina than we have with Russia; because an American has a right to expatriate himself and go to Russia and join the Poles, or get up a rebellion among the serfs, and take his chance against the government of the Czar and the knout.

But here every citizen is under a solemn vow and covenant, made by our fathers, that he will not interfere. There is the Constitution—what says that instrument? “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.” That included slavery where the States chose to have it, for the framers of the Constitution found slavery existing as a settled institution in most of the thirteen independent states, and those independent States said—“We cannot make this Union unless you agree, in this Constitution, not to meddle with this domestic institution, and to deliver up our fugitives from service.” It would be just as if thirteen families should come together, in six or seven of which black help were employed, and in the others white help; and those who had black help said to those who had white—You are not to interfere with us in the matter of our help; and they all agreed to it and signed a solemn compact to that effect; but by and by, after the families had been going on prosperously and increased largely, and intermarried, for many years, some one family gets up and insists that the families which have black help shall give them up, and that no new family in the neighborhood formed out of the old ones shall be allowed to take the black help from the old families into the new ones! What an uproar there must be at once! Now we have solemnly sworn, in that Constitution, that we will not meddle with this question. Therefore, if we set, in this State, with the direct purpose of interfering with the domestic servitude in any State, old or new, we violate the solemn obligations of our oath to support the Constitution of the United States. Let us then be honest citizens and keep our oaths, or go out of the Union if we cannot abide its laws. Can any man of common sense read this clause in the Constitution and not understand it?

“No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, [and this means northern apprentices just as much as southern slaves,] escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be disengaged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.”

There is the Constitution in just so many plain words; and yet these Know Nothings and Abolitionists went into the Legislature last winter, and in the face of their oaths and the Constitution, declared that he should not be “delivered up.”

A VOICE. “Good!”

Mr. HALETT. That same voice says, “Good!” again. Yes, “Good” to violate an oath! “Good” to be perfidious! “Good” to turn traitor to your country! What good comes from perfidy or treason? No, my friends, rather than perfuse yourselves upon this solemn pledge for the life of a Union, rather than go in the face of the Constitution, take the next step, you Fusion men, you Julius Rockwell men, you denationalized Democrats, you Know Nothings, all of you who have gone or are going into this Fusion party, and say you are going against the aggressions of the slave power. Do not add hypocrisy to treason. Do not pretend that you can constitutionally violate the Constitution, that you can dissolve the Union in the Union; but take the next step, the bold and honest *treason doctrine* of Garrison and his school—viz: that the Constitution does pledge you to non-interference with slavery, and therefore you go against the Union as a covenant with death and hell! Neither can you stop in Kansas or the new States. If you have power there you have power in the old States. That is only your first step. The next step in that direction is already marked

out by the recent convention of radical Abolitionists held in Boston, who declared that the next principle for the Fusion party to adopt was, that the Constitution did not authorize slavery anywhere, and, therefore, we had a right under the Constitution to abolish it in all the States! And further, if that was not good doctrine, then they would put down the Constitution and dissolve the Union! That is only your next step; and that is the next step you will all take, Know Nothings and all, in the onward course of fusion to disunion, unless we break your legs before you get there, as I verily believe we shall. [Laughter and applause.]

WHAT DO THEY MEAN BY THE SLAVE POWER?

Now, as to this “paramount issue,” which the new school call going against the *aggressions of the slave power*. What is it? What is that slave power they have in view? To hear their orators talk you would suppose that the South had been committing some enormous outrage upon the North. What is it? Ask one merchant, mechanician, and business man; where is there anybody that has been harmed or robbed by the South? You cannot find anybody. Then what is this “aggression of the slave power?” I will tell you what the South has done which the old Federal party never forgave, and the new Fusion party never will forgive. The Democratic party of the North and the Democratic party of the South, standing together, have governed this country by Democratic men and Democratic measures ever since 1801, when they elected Thomas Jefferson President. The Federal party, the National Republican party, the Whig party, the Abolition party, the Free-Soul party, the Know Nothing party, the Fusion party—every side issue that has been got up from that day to this has been a combination to break down the Democratic power that has wisely ruled this country; and national Democracy, which has triumphed only by the union of northern and southern Democrats, they call the *slave power*, in order to cry “mad dog,” and run it down!

That is it, brother Democrats! Oh! how I wish you could remember that! How I wish every Democrat throughout this broad land would stand on that rock when these agitators and denouncers make their empty declamations about the aggressions of the South upon the North! Why, I ask you, if Democratic influences had not controlled this country, what would it have been? A little margin of thirteen Atlantic States, and that is all. That is what the Federal party undertook to make these States in order to keep the political power. The Federal party had its strength at the North, and so has all the opposition to Democratic administrations from Jefferson to Pierce. Why did the old Federal party of the North assail the South? Because the South had *Thomas Jefferson*, and sustained him with the aid of the Democrats of the North! That was why they assailed the South. Thomas Jefferson took the lead as the great head of the Democratic party. John Adams was then the head of the Federal party of the North. The southern Democracy and the northern Democracy rallied around Jefferson; and even in Massachusetts, in 1801, the Democracy gave the vote of this state to Thomas Jefferson against John Adams, and they were called for so doing the “white slaves of Virginia.” It was by that union of the North with the South that the Democratic principles of this Government were established.

There is a stand-point upon which every Democrat and every Union man should place himself to overlook this question of pretended aggressions of the slave power upon the North. Admirably cogently has this topic been presented with elaborate research, in an article by the Boston Post, published in that paper of November 1, (and Statesmen, November 2,) headed “*The Democratic Party and the Alleged Slave Power.*”

UNION OF NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN DEMOCRATS.

And how has it been since 1801? In fourteen presidential elections, eleven have been carried solely by the union of the northern and southern Democracy; and whenever the Federal party, or the National Republican party, or the Whig party, or the hard cider party, have stolen into power, (three times only in all that period,) how have they done it? By anti-slavery lecturers, and political persons, and renegade Democrats, traveling over the North, and telling the Democrats that the slave power was enslaving them and picking their pockets, and they must go against the slave power! And thus, once or twice in our history, enough deluded Democrats have been carried over to the Federalists, the Whigs, and the Abolitionists, to put down the Democratic power of the North and South combined together. That is what these Fusion and Know Nothing conspirators are after now; the old game of divide and conquer.

Thus we find Mr. William H. Seward, of New York, beginning his campaign against the Constitution by crying out about the “oligarchy of the South.” By that cry of

"mad dog" he means the *Democracy of the South*, which, when it unites with the *Democracy of the North*, has always been invincible and always carries this country. It is the oligarchy of the Democratic people, North and South, which, Mr. Seward *knows*, if united, will be too strong for his "Fusion oligarchy," which he wants to make him President, that he may crush out the *Democracy of the South*, and then easily conquer the *Democracy of the North*.

THE TRIUMPHS OF THE UNITED DEMOCRACY, NORTH AND SOUTH.

Fellow Democrats, be not deceived. Who put down the tyranny of the alien and sedition laws? Who purchased Louisiana and Florida? Who secured the navigation of the mighty Mississippi? Who fought for free trade and sailors' rights? Who carried the country through the second war of independence in 1812? Who prostrated the paper-money power, the United States Bank? Who gave you a sound currency, an Independent Treasury, the great balance wheel of trade and commerce? Who put an end to the nullification of 1833, and finally established a just tariff that all now acquiesce in? Who annexed Texas? Who put down the Wilmot proviso? Who carried the country through the Mexican war with glory, and gave to the commerce and trade of the North the golden California? And finally, who has expanded this country from fourteen States, and brought into the Union *seventeen new States* with all the rights of the old States, with or without slavery as the people of each State chose to have it? Who has done all this for your country? *The Democratic party, the Democrats of the North and South united together!* [Loud applause.] That is what these narrow-minded sectional men of the North, these bigots and Know Noughts, designate as "the slave power."

Now I will sit down with any one of the Free-Soilers or Know Noughts, or Fusion men, and beginning at 1861, I will trace every measure of liberal and enlarged statesmanship, every great act of this Government for the good of the whole Union, everything that has expanded its territory, everything that has enlarged and democratized its influence, everything that has elevated its glory abroad, everything that has insured its tranquility at home, and one by one I will show you that they have been accomplished by the united votes of the northern and southern Democracy. Whenever a Democratic measure has ruled, whenever Little carried his charter for a bank, whenever the Sub-Treasury was checked, whenever a high tariff has been imposed, it has been owing to a division of northern Democrats from those of the South, and allowing the Federal Whig party to come in and take the power. That is the way it has been; and taking all the history of the past and looking to the future, you may rest assured, that whenever these men, with their insidious sneers about the "have power," can bring about a separation and alienation between the northern and southern Democracy, they will open the way to an entire change or dissolution of Democratic government, and strike a fatal blow at the best interests of this country,—at the only party in whose hands these interests have been or can remain safe.

Tell me, after seventy years of such statesmanship, tell me that I, as a Democrat, had to turn my back upon those true men of the South and sympathize with—*God knows who!* Yes! who are these leaders of Know Noughts, Abolitionists, Fusionists, and all the party *causes* of the day that make Massachusetts a political Babel? We never saw these men (except a few we always knew to be so) and uncertain) in the Democratic ranks, fighting for us in any of these great battles of principles. When they pretended to stand on a Democratic platform, we always found them upon some plank that had a side issue to it, and standing so narrow on that as only to get on the edge of it! [Applause.] Let us not take counsel of these narrow-minded men. Let us look all over the country, and then we shall see where our largest and truest interests lie. Above all things let the northern and southern Democracy *stand together* in this coming crisis of the Union, as they have stood together, and triumphed together, for half a century of glory!

THE "NEBRASKA INQUINITY"—THE "KANSAS OUTRAGE."

Well, some of you tell me that may do as to past measures, but how can we of the North submit to this horrible outrage of the South in the "Nebraska iniquity" and the Kansas bill? The Fusionists, driven from every other position, stand on this at me. Their whole doctrine (if Senator Sumner is its expounder) is that there shall be no slavery in *any* Territory or new State. This is only the old Wilmot proviso. Excluding that proviso, putting it down, obliterating the black line, as the whole Democracy agreed to do in the compromise of 1850, and the glorious

election of General Pierce in 1852, is the whole principle of the Nebraska and Kansas bill. That is the "iniquity," the "terrible outrage," the "aggression of the slave power," against which you are told all friends of freedom must "faze," for the purpose of preventing Kansas from becoming a slave State.

Now, if the men who started this hunt had only followed the principle of the Nebraska bill, viz: left it to the people, Kansas would inevitably have been a free State. I do not know what she will be now. These Fusion, Know Noughts have gone there with their propaganda of abolitionism, and the South has met them with the propaganda of slavery. If northern Abolitionists and southern slaveholders wish to make that Territory a battle-ground, let them fight it out—at the ballot-box, I hope—but even if at the point of the bayonet knife, what is the Government of these United States, what are the other States of the Union going to do about it, in Congress or out of it? Are they going to take sides, and bring on a civil and a servile war between the North and South?

They say the President should have sent an army there. What power has he there? If he had moved a single step, with a single company of dragoons, the country would have been in an uproar, and the cry would have resounded on every hand, "Military Usurper!" "Tyrant!" "Violator of the Constitution!" He has no such power. What would have been the effect had he attempted such a power? If it be a fact that they are divided between emigrants from the North, and emigrants or interlopers from the South in Kansas, how are you going to settle it by the whole Union interfering? If the President send one body of troops there to aid the northern portion, Missouri will send another body to help the southern portion. If you rally at the North to sustain the troops the President has sent, they will volunteer at the South on the other side; and when you have got an army there of fifty thousand men, on either side, then they may fight, if there is courage in these Fusion men at the North to go South and fight. "Courage?" no, *folly*. The North does not lack courage; it has got courage enough; but I do not think it has got *foots* enough to go to Kansas to fight on such a question as this. [Applause.]

What have you got to do, then? Why, let it alone! It will take care of itself. Leave the question of slavery or no slavery in Kansas just where our fathers left that question, to *God and the people!* [Applause.]

THE PRINCIPLE OF THE KANSAS BILL.—POPULAR RIGHTS.

Now, what is the principle of that Kansas bill? Why you the Democratic party come to that doctrine? Will you consider the argument a moment? No, no, clamor the Fusionists and Know Noughts, you have violated a solemn compact! Well, is it worth while for these men to talk about the violation of a compact in a mere legislative enactment, when they trample upon the solemn compacts of the Constitution? They are not the men to read us lessons on that head. But here comes the argument, the reason why Democrats abide by the Kansas bill, and will make that an issue on which they will carry the next President. Ever since the Missouri compromise of 1820, Congress has been kept in tumult and agitation on this subject of slavery. It got to be so great a nuisance in breeding demagogues, that the people could not have any wholesome legislation. Private and public interests were alike thrown aside, because this angry subject of slavery was being brought up at all times. Now, so long as Congress undertook to exercise the power to prohibit or authorize slavery in the Territories, that sort of agitation was kept open, and the men who got to Congress upon this demagogic kept irritating and irritating it, until it would have destroyed the Union, had not some stop to the plague been found. What did the statesmen of the country do? They said, "Let us look at this matter. It belongs to the States, and the people in the States must take care of it. The same principle is equally sound when applied to the people of a Territory. Instead of saying whether slavery shall or shall not exist in the Territories, we will organize the Territories and let the people there settle it for themselves. They will know best what is for their interest."

That is the principle of the Kansas bill. There is not a man here, probably, who has ever read the Kansas bill. The Free-Soul lecturers do not read it to the people. It is one of the most Democratic things in the world. It provides that every actual resident shall be a voter at the first election, and then the Legislature shall fix the qualifications; that those only shall be members of the first Legislature who are "duly declared by the Governor to have the highest number of *legal* votes." So that the Kansas Legislature, but as it may be, was entitled by Governor Read to have received the highest number of *legal* votes. Then, when it came to act and pass laws, it had the same



rights to make laws under the Constitution as the Legislature of Massachusetts had, and it can hardly have passed more lawless acts than that Legislature did! The powers of legislation established by the Kansas and Nebraska acts are in these words:

"The legislative power shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation consistent with the Constitution of the United States and this act. It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people *there* perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

Is not that sound Democratic doctrine? Is anybody opposed to that? -- But there is a set of "border ruffians," they say, "who invade that Territory from the other side of the river, and control the elections." That is all wrong, and will I set against the wrong-doers; but if there is wrong done, we cannot cure it by civil war. The voters, by the Kansas act, at the *first* election, were to be "actual residents." What is "an actual resident" in *Kansas*? Are we to settle it in other States, or must they settle it there for themselves? A man goes into Kansas and swears today, "I am an actual resident." They cannot dispute him, for it rests in his own mind and purpose, and they take his vote; and in that way all these men that go there from Missouri, if *not* residents, must have taken false oaths, and perjured themselves. But, you say, behind that is the power of the Government, and it ought to interfere. That is a mistake. We should thank God that the President of the United States has no such power. He has power to execute the laws of the United States, whenever they are resisted, but he has no right to pass judgment on the acts of a legislative body acting under an organic law.

Gov. *ruer* *Reeder* himself organized the Legislature of Kansas, under the organic law of the Territory, and when they got together they had the power of other Legislatures, and they prescribed the qualifications of voters under the Constitution. Can the President interfere? Shall not the Kansas Legislature have that right? We have it here in Massachusetts; do you mean to give it up to somebody else? and if not, will you take it away from them?

But the Legislature of Kansas, you say, have abused their powers. Very likely. That is just what the Know Nothings have done here in Massachusetts most abominably, but are we going to have Kansas interfere to regulate those abuses? No! Then what business have you to go to Kansas to legislate for them or regulate them, if they have abused their powers?

WHO SHALL MAKE THE LOCAL LAWS OF A TERRITORY?

And this brings us to the simple question, shall Congress make local laws for a Territory, or shall the people of the Territory make their own local laws? Democrats say yes. Fusionists say no, the people of the Territories *shall not* have the right of self-government, and the new States *shall not* have the same rights when they come into the Union than Massachusetts has. There we take issue upon this plain, open, practical, Jeffersonian doctrine, that the people of every political community shall have the right "to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States?" That is the Kansas bill; and now I may ask, are you in favor of freedom, or are you in favor of slavery for *white men* in Kansas? If you say that they are not to be trusted, because you fear they will carry slaves from other States into Kansas, then you deny self-government of the people, and go for *white* slavery in Kansas, under the self-conceited pretense that you can govern for them better than they can govern for themselves.

THE CONSCIENCE ISSUE APPLIED TO KANSAS.

But you insist that your conscience will not allow you to

going on in this country many things that can't help, and

It has been so

political turmoil.

0 011 897 813 4

... and may desire that Kansas, as a single slave more in this Union should become only a *free white* State. The question is not whether freemen, black or white, shall be made slaves, but whether some portions more or less of the slaves living on one side of a river or State line shall live on the other side and still be slaves, or continue to be slaves where they now are? Is this so great a matter, then, of such awful "paramount" interest as a one idea, that the North is bound to go on a crusade against the South under these Abolition and Know Nothing missionaries, and drive slavery out of Kansas or drive the South out of the Union?

What avails it now to talk of repealing the Nebraska bill? There it is a law of this Union, and the Democrats of the Union are ready to meet it as an issue, because it is the only conservative doctrine concerning slavery as an incident in our State governments, upon which the whole country, South and North, can repose in peace. Hereafter, when we settle this one principle, (as we shall in the next presidential election) by applying it to Territories the same as to States, we can go forward peacefully in the great mission of covering this continent all over with independent States bound together in this glorious Union. The people of no Territory or new State will have slavery unless they permanently desire it as a fixed element in their domestic institutions. Should it at first be forced upon a Territory by "border ruffians" or intruders, the reaction of the will of the permanent settlers will be the more efficient in the end in excluding it. Thus, if the real and permanent people of Kansas shall resolve upon having a *free* State, including blacks, Kansas will be *free*, without slaves, within her territory. But if her people, deliberately looking at their own affairs, resolve that she shall be a *free* State with slaves in it, (for that is the only difference between *free* and *slave* States in this Union) I do not know what right we of the North have to interfere. All we can say to her is, we think you have the worst of it; you have got to hold the wolf by the ears, and we will not let her pull us to enrage him, or to rend the Union. [Applause.]

SLAVE REPRESENTATION.

As to the argument touching slave representation, much the worst for Kansas. If she, like the South, has slave labor, it excludes just so much free labor, and so weakens her political power, as it does in all the slaveholding States; for the slaves, who exclude free laborers from the population, count in the ratio of representation (not in voting, as fools and knaves construct the Constitution on that point) but three in five; whereas the laborers of the North, whether voters or non voters, count like men, five in five. Strange inconsistency that the Abolitionists should complain that a negro counts too much when he counts only three in five to the whites!

Therefore, my friends, let us repose in confidence upon this sound Democratic principle of self-government, State rights, and fidelity to the Constitution. When we bring the anti-slavery pretenders, and the fusion demagogues, and the Know Nothings down to this plain, practical, commonsense issue, they have no resource but invective against the "slave power" and the "slave oligarchy"; and there let them rail; and so God help us, and incline our hearts to love the Union, and we of the northern and southern national Democracy with the Union loving men of all parties acting with us, will stand together and vote them down in the next presidential election, as we have done for fifty years, and thus continue to preserve the Union and the rights of the States in spite of foes without and traitors within! [Cheers.]



0 011 897 813 4

HOLLINGER
pH 8.5
MILL RUN F3-1543